1875
(L.R.)

File. No. 3.
Serial. No. 1-27.

Sub: Claims of Sayed Sha Ali Peeran and Narayan Bibi to the makkam of Thannur.

90

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

~~L. R. U. of 1875.~~

Later references.

1875.

~~191~~ .

(Land Revenue).

File No. 3

Serial Nos. 1 2 7

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1-27.

Part B for February 1881.

SUBJECT.

Claims of Syed Shah Afi Peeran and Narayan Bibi to the makkan of Thannur

---

Indexed

L. Srinivasa Rao.

W D 88—GPB—50,000—24-7-16

11 1

No. 1954

Name of Petitioner. Syed Aha Ali Bin Khadri Mokandar

Village. Jamnad

Taluk. Ashtagram

District. Kanara

Date of Arzi. 1st August 1875

Date of Receipt. 4th Do - Do

Date of Disposal.

ABSTRACT.

States that a dispute having arisen between him and Syed Shah Mahomed Sowis Saval about the right of management of the Mahim, the Deputy Commr ordered the dispute to be settled by a Shall Panchayet, two to be nominated by the petitioner and one by the Mamlatdar officer. The Arbitrators nominated by the Mamlatdar officer should have been a stranger, but the one selected was a brother-in-law to the members selected by petitioner's opponent. The petitr protested against the nomination. The Shall Panchayet should have been composed of men of the place instead of which they were strangers. Prays that orders may be issued to quash the irregular proceedings of the Panchayet, and other

In Petition should address his Petition was nominated his Brothers after Panchayet meeting his objections, against the Mamlatdar meeting -

1875

2/9/75

The Petr: states that he protested against the Constitution of the Panchayet from the first, the President of the Panchayet to whom each of the Pet has not objected to arbitration. The decision of the Panchayet is already sufficient to regulate the Payment of the Government Amount and it is open to the Pet to establish his claim against the Claimants in the Civil Courts.

The Proceedings have been drawn up in a careless manner & not approved of by the Assistant Collr

9/9/75



COURT FEE
GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE INDIA
ONE ANNA

No. 1154
DESPATCHED

4

The Honorable Mr. Dalyell

Offg. Chief Commissioner of

Mysore & Coorg.

Most respectfully Sheweth

A dispute having arisen as to the right of management of the station at Sunnoor between the Petitioner and Syed Shaw Mohamed Gaus Sahib the Deputy Comr. of Mysore District decided that the dispute should be settled by a Steel Punchayet and for which purpose both the Claimants should select two Arbitrators. The third should be nominated by the Mooktoy officer. These three together should select two more Punchayetdars.

If the above arrangements was made fairly I would have willingly submitted, but there were gross irregularities, viz.

1. The third arbitrator nominated by the Mooktoy officer ought to be a stranger to both parties representation. But it is not so in this case. He is a brother-in-law of the arbitrator selected by 2d claimant. Petitioner has protested against this appointment from the very beginning.

2d The Deputy Commissioner ordered to assemble a Steel Punchayet, viz, The arbitrators should be of the same place having local knowledge, whereas every one of them in this instance has been an utter stranger to the place.

3d The appointment of Punchayet is against the old rules of the late Sir Mark Cubbon and further in the year 1866 a Circular was issued to the Commissioner of the Nundi Droog Division to the effect that all disputes regarding Mosjids other religious institutions should be referred to Civil Courts.

For the reasons above stated Petitioner prays that the irregular Proceedings of the above Punchayet be quashed and the parties permitted to settle their disputes in a Civil Court as it was at first ordered by Mr Krishna Row

For which act of kindness I shall ever pray for your long life and prosperity.

I beg to remain

Most respectfully Sir

سید شاہ علی پیران قادری

Your most obedient servant Syed Shaw Ally Peeran Khadree Muktandar of Yunnoor in the Astgram Tallook.

Bungalow
31st August 1875

سید شاہ پیران قادری

COURT FEE
GOVERNMENT MYSORE OF INDIA
EIGHT ANNAS

No 1299.

Dy Commrs Office
Mysore District
Dated Mysore 15 March 75.

To
The Commissioner
Admn: Division

Sir

Adverting to your docket No 287 of the 9th June last I have the honor to report that on the matter of the rival claims to the management of the Somnoor Durgah being submitted to arbitration it has been decided by the arbitrators, with only one dissenting voice, that Syed Shah Mahomed Gouse Gowlias is the actual descendant and heir of the recognized Mahandas Rakesha, that the statement made by Khasim Khan (Moojawer ~~Cafir~~) before the Mooazir Offices that he was his agent is to be relied upon and that Syd Saheb's widow had no right to alienate the allowance made for the Muckan to her alleged adopted daughter, who is the wife of one of the claimants named Syed Ali Beeu.

Sanction is now requested to effect

being

being given to the decision arrived at by the arbitrators by payment of the allowance for the Durgah being made with arrears to the said Shah Mahomed Gouse Gowalier and to his name being registered as the Mutawalar.-

An English memo of the case prepared by the Mooffussil Officer together with a translation of the Mahazar and all the proceedings connected therewith are are forwarded for any further reference that may be needed + to be obliged returned.

I have &c
Sigd W. Hill
Dy Commissioner

Memo.

Syed Mooskin, Syed Shah Mahomed Gouse Gowalier and Syed Ali Beem respectively claimed the right to manage the affairs of the Mutawal at Tonnoor in the Ashtagram Taluk.-

2. Syed Mooskin's claim was rejected on the ground that he was only a servant in the Mutawal and that he was remunerated for his service by a certain allowance

(vide

(rde decree of the late Adalut Court filed with the accompanying proceedings.

3. Syed Cha Mahomed Gouse Gawakier based his claim on the fact that he was the grandson of the recognized Superintendent of the Inakan named Rahéesha and adopted son of the late Sajade Saib (a son of the said Rahesha) who was also the Managers of the Inakan.

4 Syed Ali Beiu claimed the management of the Inakan on the ground that he was the husband of one Imreembee for whose maintenance the allowance to the Inakan had been allotted by her adoptive mother Khojadeha, widow of Sajade Saib the last manager of the Inakan and the adoptive father of the 2nd claimant Syd Cha Mahomed Gouse Gowakier.-

5. As Khasim Khan Mooqavi (the agent of the last manager of the Inakan who was looking after the affairs even after the death of the said Sajade Saib till the present litigation arose) having given

Contradictory

contradictory statements as to whose agent he was, and as it could not be ascertained from the Varavards who was actually enjoying the allowance to the Inaam the then Moozroi Officer Mr. Krishna Murti was of opinion that the 2nd and 3rd Claimants should be referred to a Civil Court for the determination of the rights, and that a disinterested person should be be appointed to manage the affairs of the Inaam pending the decision of the Civil Court.

-6. The Commissioner submitted the proceedings held by Mr. Krishna Murti to the Commr. who directed that the dispute should be settled by arbitration, or that the parties should be referred to a Civil Court.

7. The following persons were appointed to arbitrate the question at issue.

1. Mahomed Moosa Raja was selected by the 2nd claimant
2. Sheik Ahomed Saib by the 3rd Do.
3. Amildar of the Mysore Talook was nominated by the Moozroi Officer.

COURT FEE
GOVERNMENT MYSORE OF INDIA
EIGHT ANNAS F.

L. S.

18

4. Hajee Syed Shaboodeen Sha Khadri and
5. Mahomad ali Sahib were selected by
the three first Punchayets

All these men with the exception of the
second, who is in favor of Syed Ali Peer, are
unanimously of opinion that Syed Sha Mahomed
Gouse Gavahier is the actual descendant
and heir of the recognized Makander, Sahé-
sha, that Khasim Khan Moozavir's state-
ment before the Muzroy Officer to the effect
that he was the agent of the 2nd claimant
may be relied upon and that Sajadé Saibs
widow had no right to alienate the al-
lowance of the Makan to her alleged ado-
pted daughter the wife of the said Syed Ali
Peer the 3rd claimant.

Signed R. C. Shunmugavelu Pillé
Officer Incharge of the
Inoozzion Department
Nipore District.

Mahazir of Shikalmed Punchayetdar
chosen by Syed Shaw ali Peeran Kadri.—

The Makkan at Tonnoor was at
first

first put in charge of atta oolla saib by Nabob Bhadar (meaning Hyderabad) this Gentleman (atta oolla shaw) had no male issue, but to his daughter Hakee Boonisaw Begam he presented all his property together with the Nakans at Sonnoor and Bangalore, and the Jaghir at Salem, marrying her to Nabbi Shaw. Afterwards, in 1814. His Highness the late Maharaja renewed the Sunnad of Sonnoor in favor of Nabbi Shaw, who had 4 sons. The eldest son Badie saib died in infancy. The second son Ranjale Shaw Sajade saib had no issue. The third son was Shaw Goolam Hoosain alias acha Meeya, and the fourth Jania Pacha saib.

After the death of Nabbi Shaw his eldest surviving son Sajade shaw assumed the title of Nakandar, taking possession of the Nakkans at Sonnor and Bangalore. the 3rd & 4th sons having been put in possession of the Nakkan and Jaghir at Salem they lived separate from each other after having divided the property between themselves.

All

All these facts are verified from the Judgment No 66 of the late adalat Court passed in the year 1835. The Canarese and Hindustani Inahizes of Kizzi of 1245 declares that Sajada Saib is Hukdar to the lands attached to the Joonoor Durgah. This Inahazadas is the one drawn up by Potels Shambogues and pyats of Joonoor. From the Attikuppa Talook accounts of the year 1836, it will be seen that the name of Sajada Saib is mentioned in the Baravard. Major Chalmers in his Hookoom No 5 of 1836 recognized Sajada Saib as Inakundar and Kassim Khan as his agent.

Colonel J. Clerk also, in his Hookoom No 280 dated 15th November 1858, following the example of Major Chalmers has ordered the payment of the allowance of the Inakan to Kassim Khan agent of Sajada Saib, or to his people. In another Hookoom No 39 dated 15th March 1859 the same order is repeated with an addition that all surplus monies should be delivered by Kassim Khan to Sajada Saib -

In

In the year 1862 the Baraward was in the name of Sajadé Saib and the name of Kassim Khan is also mentioned in it as agent. In a report addressed by Raguvad Roi Amildar of Ashtagram Talook to the Inoozoo Officer in 1872 a Kyfeit from Inooza wara Kassim Khan and Ali Peera was enclosed. In their Kyfeit the Inoozawar and the other person have stated that the proper Managers of the Inukkaw were Sajadé Saib, after him Bee Bee Saib (the lady) and then adopted son Khan Goolam Hoosein father of Marian Bee wife of Sijad Ali Peera, that these persons have been in enjoyment of the Inakkaw successively, that in the year 1867, Bee Bee Saib (the lady) executed a Stamp paper Document in favor of Goolam Hoosein Nephew of Nabbi Khan Saib mentioning also the name of Marian Bee for maintenance.

The Amildar therefore recommended that as Marian Bee was the Hukdar the certificate should be given in her name. In a Kyfeit given by Inoozawar Kassim

Khan

Khan on the 6th October 1872, he states that the Hakdar of the Makkan is Marian Bee, that himself and Syed Moosakkin may be granted a certificate as the agents of the said Marian Bee. In the same Kyfiat Kassim Khan acknowledges his having been employed originally by Kajade Sait, and states that his wife Kajade Bee alias Bee Bee said has him and other servants of the Makkan summoned before her, and declared to them that she had executed a document on stamp paper in favor of Marian Bee wife of Alli Peera renouncing her right in the Makan for the maintenance of Marian Bee, that the latter and her husband Alli Peera were therefore the proper persons to be placed in charge of the service of the Makkan and they (the servants) should obey them, obtaining for her (marian Bee) the necessary certificate also.

Sd/-

Shek Inooshkin in his kyfeit of the same month states that shew Goolam Hoossein is the Hukdar, but where he is living he does not know. And that he has produced some papers in his possession. The Amildar in his report No 261 dated 6th December 1872 states that Inoozdiwar Kassim Khan is a servant, his pay is Rs 11-11-2 the man by name Shek Inooshin is the Inookally whose pay is Rs 3 and odd, and that the principal Hukdar of Joinoor Pinkan is Imaman Bee

From the Hindustani letters written by Kassim Khan to alli Peeran up to August 1873, it is clear that alli Peeran is the proper person to receive the allowance of the Inakkan, and that Kassim Khan is a servant. But the depositions given by Kassim Khan on the 8th and 19th September 1873 and the contents of the petitions presented

by

Syes Shaw
Inahs Gouse
Sootari

by him are by no means worthy of credit.
And the deposition of Gouse Peera 2nd
Takeardar in the same year given in
accordance with the Kyfeit of Kassim
Khan does not establish the Takeardars
right to the Inakkan

From the Hindustani Inakaza
given at Bangalore it is clear that the
2nd Takeardar was not at Bangalore and
that Kassim Khan paid the Inakkan
money to alli Peera and his wife Inanan
Bee. From a petition addressed on the
13th of — 1674 by alli Sapade Syed Shaw,
Goolam Shakkin ahomed Saib Shoorari
it is evident that the enjoyment of the
Sowmoor Inakkan belongs to alli Peera
and his wife Inanan Bee. All other papers
do not prove the claim of the other Takear-
dars, and will be seen by the following
proofs.

The 1st Takeardar Syed Inookin
is only a paid servant, and has no
manner of claim to the Inakkan

the

the 2nd Takkardar Syed Gouse Peera Syed Shah Inkd House
was appointed by Sajade Saib 40 years ago
as his agent, and since then he drew
the allowance of the Inakkan and deduct-
-ing therefrom his own pay as well as that
of Kassim Khan, he paid the rest without
any objection to Sajade Saib. After the
latters death he acted under his (Sajade
Saibs) wife Koojadee Bee Alias Bee, Bee
Sabas order accordingly, paying the money
regularly. On the 22nd August 1872 the
said Kodjade Bee having adopted Maniam
Bee daughter of Goolam Hoosein Shootaré
brother of her husband Sajade Saib, gave
her in marriage to Syed Khan alli Peera,
and in order to conduct the duties of the
Inakkan properly she executed a document
on stamp in favor of Maniam Bee, and that
after her father Khan Goolam Sootaré,
handing over to them all Sunnads and
other papers - Whén this document was
executed the brothers of the 2nd Takkar-
-dar, by name Kadir Pacha, Mooshed

Peera

COURT FEE
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MYSORE
EIGHT ANNAS

Peera, and Syed Khan, Cazi Hoosein were present and have signed (as witnesses) the documents in question. She also charges at that time Kassim Khan and other servants of the Makkan to obey the orders of Imaian Bee &c. behaving towards her with all respect as usual. In accordance with this request and until the year 1872, Kassim Khan was under the order paying the money &c to Syed Ali Peera and her husband (sic) Imaian Bee, while the latter appeared at the Makan on alleged extraordinary occasions in room of his wife who as a Mahomedan woman was incapacitated from appearing in the public. Kassim Khan however latterly behaved treacherously towards the rightful Makandars, and therefore Ali Peera dismissed him from service. Since then both the wife and husband have lived in the Makkan of Vellore and are in fact inchar of the keys of the institution.

About 30 months ago the 2nd Takeanda House,

27

Gouda Rama Sah having contenanced
Kassim Khan, and thereby made him
his own partizan gave depositions
conjointly with him to the the effect
that money was sent to Bangalore
to himself (the 2nd claimant) for the
last 10 years and that letters passed
between them by post, petitioning, mean-
while that he was the proper Zemindar.
But there is nothing in the Proceedings
to prove their statement, nor is there any
other evidence to prove their case except
the bare word of Kassim Khan. On the
contrary it is plain from the Proceedings
that the 2nd claimant had no enjoy-
ment whatever of the Tonnoor Pakkan.
3rd It has been proved, however beyond
a doubt, from the records of the Akkitippa
and Sahtagram Talooks, the Amaldars
from Bangalore the letters which
Kassim Khan wrote to Bangalore to
Alli Rama and others - Petitions from
Sajadi dail at Bangalore - Amaldar

by

1875.

From Tahsildar

To The Commissioner of the Ashtagram Division

Dated Bangalore 8th Septr

Despatched ——— 9 ——

Received ——/3——

ENCLOSURES NO. 1 with

General No. 4341

No. 179

Forwards a petition No 1154 dated 1st August 1875 from Syed Ghia Ali Khan Khadri praying that he may be granted the Jaghir connected with the office of the Tahsildar of the Ashtagram Taluk may be forwarded to the office

By Order

Tahsildar

Copy

Received 5-16

No. 1591

Name of Petitioner. Syed Shahabe Buran Khadree Mukander of Tennoor Durga

Village.

Taluk. Adoni

District. Bellary.

Date of Arzi. 16/9/75

Date of Receipt. 17/9/75

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. one. (copy).

ABSTRACT.

In continuation of his last petition regarding Ghouse Jeran's claim of a share from Shaik Ken Ahmed Sahib the Sujjadey and Mukander of Nabee Shah Sahib's Dargah, begs the proceedings of the Case may be called for from the Bangalore Asst Comm's Court where the Case was tried and given against Claimant, when Pet'r will produce a Summons proving his claim.

Submits copy of the order of the Asst Comm's Bangalore for perusal.

PSR
20/9/75

Petition sent to Bangalore Asst Comm's Court for report 5/11/75

Petitioner to be informed that the 1154 has been forwarded to the Asst Comm's Court for report

Petitioner to be informed that the case cannot be called for from the Bangalore Asst Comm's Court

Petitioner to be also called for an immediate Certified Petition.

1591
1154
B/11/75

Drafted
6/11/75

No Record Kept

Translation of a Petition from Syed Abdulla Ali Reza Sahib Bahadur of Tanjore to the Board of the 1st Class Native Lieutenant Commandant of Bayonets

dt 18th December 1874

The Amildar of Tanjore is the Brahmin — Name of Some Reza Sahib who is dispute about the Bahadur — Shaboodeen Sahib is a Bad[x] magazine and a Sitha[x] Mussalman — Jadwahs were removed from Madras prohibiting his being allowed into the Magistrates Office (Magazine) and that he could not be depended upon in any way — There are many Magazines given in this subject — The above named two individuals (Shaboodeen and the Amildar) joined Some Riots and got them Police admitted as members of the Panchayet — Presented a petition to the Commissioner protesting against the above named individuals being admitted as Panchayetdars and also mentioned this to the Board, and likewise presented a petition by officers on the 6th December 1874 to the above effect — The Petition to the Commissioner

x bad do of

x A Jemindar of Native Troops

to commence in the Court. The Panchayet consisted of four individuals on the part of Gowda Pia. These members are his relatives and accomplices - while one individual on my part was admitted. This is contrary to the civil Rules according to which, two members viz Shabodin and the Caide Cowzi Ali Sahib should be removed and two Barbats or merchants should be appointed in their stead, or otherwise let the Panchayet not consist of men selected by the parties, but the Court may invite the Amildar assemble a fresh Panchayet. As the Panchayet on my side is a man from Bangalore, the settlement is delayed in order to induce him to go away - A new Panchayet should be convened by the Court. I have already protested against the above mentioned Panchayet they that the court invite protest me according to the Rules - They are debarred

to

Translation of the Will and Testament left by Khojadee Bee Widow of Sazzade Shaik the Sheikdar to the Wakan of Sonnur 16/22nd August 1867 Bangalore.

I, Khojadee Bee Widow of Sazzade Shaik, Makandar of Sonnur, while in full possession of all my natural faculties and powers, make in perfect harmony with the rules, customs &ca of my Caste and Creed, this my Will and last Testament as follows:-

I have Ceremoniously adopted one Mareem Bee daughter of my uncle's Son, and married her to one Alli Peeran, who has from a child been under my roof. To these and especially for the maintenance and hereditary enjoyment in his family in future, I have solemnly assigned the right of Management of the Sonnur Durga, its inam lands which yield an annual income of 60 Pagodas, and all the Sunnuds, documents &ca in my husbands, and after him in my own possession.

Where

There are to my knowledge no others to dispute the claim of this Durga and should any such in future arise, this my Will will nullify their claims, be they my own or my husband's relatives, near or distant. Besides I invest my adopted daughter and my Son-in-law with full power to enjoy all the allowances made by the inhabitants on all occasions, to perform duly all the Makan rites, to dismiss old, or nominate new Servants in the Makan. They should at the same time by no means alienate the Makan Inam Lands.

Sealed by Khajadeebee and the late Bakshi Saleb ali Khan.

B Ramakrishna Row.

C-96.

General

No. 266

1875

From The Commissioner of the Nilgiris

To

Secretary to Chief Commissioner,
General Department.

Dated Ootacamund 5th November 1875

Despatched

Received 8

ENCLOSURES NO. Nil.

General No. 622 } 1875—76.
Judl. No. 242

I have the honor to forward herewith Docket No. 454/179 dated 8th September 1875 requesting to forward the Proceedings connected with the Case of the Tommur Dwigadu Vs Ashtagoram Valikk.

I forwards the Proceedings as requested.

The Enclosures of the docket under acknowledgment are herewith returned.

I have the honor
Sir
Your most obedient
Servant
Commissioner
Nilgiris

To
The Secretary
to Government
Fort St George

8/11/75

Recd 8/11/75

1/C-96

Genl 1875. Ap 272

From The Commissioner Adm

To

Secretary to Chief Commissioner,
General Department.

Dated 12th

Despatched Nov 12

Received 15th
15

ENCLOSURES NO

General No. 644 } 1875—76
Genl No. 249

Dis Docket No. 6495-232

of the 8th Instant Requesting early submission of the Proceedings connected with the case of the Honorable Dwijah in the Vizagapatam Zillah.

In reply, invites attention to this Office No. 272 of the 5th Instant with which the Proceedings were forwarded &

Secretary
Commissioner
Adm

To Duftar.
Ep
15-11-75

Dis'd & Duftar on the
8/11/75

Copy 15/11/75

34

No 3678
G 108

ted 10th July 1876

1.H.
31-75

The Asletagram Com=
=missioner's R^o No. 622/242 dated
5th November 1875, submit=
=ting the Vernacular record
connected with the case
of Syed Shah Ali Peeran
Khadri, Makhaudar
of the Sonnur Durgah,
Asletagram Taluk vs
Syed Shah alias Sahomed
Saws Khadri.

Order thereon

The principal question
for determination in this
case is, whether the awar
of the Panchayetdars is
binding on Appellant.

It appears, from the
Proceedings, that the Appel=
=lant objected to the no=
=mination of some of the
Panchayetdars, and with=
=drew his consent to abide
by their decision. There was

Here

X Panchayet was composed of seven members. No one challenged at the time by the Appellant as being interested parties, and there is nothing to show that the present objection was duly taken before them.

therefore no reason why the Appellants should have been compelled to submit to the award of the arbitrators, most of whom were challenged by him prior to the case being referred to them. Another question which is involved in the case, and which is one of law, is whether the adoption by Khajadee Bee of Mareem Bee as heir to the estate is valid under the Mahomedan Law. As this is a point which could only be properly & satisfactorily tried and determined by a Competent Civil Court, the Chief Commissioner directs that the parties be referred to a regular Civil Suit for the establishment of their right, pending which the Makhan should be left in the possession of the party who was actually the

There are many conflicting rulings on the point, as it is the rule, the question should be tried & decided

Entered 16-11

No. 2044

Name of Petitioner. Syed Shaliwa Khadri, Makkandar (appellant)

Village. Thonnacoor –

Taluk. Nelamangala –

District. Mysore —

Date of Arzi. 25th September/76

Date of Receipt. 28th – do —

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. — Nil –

ABSTRACT.

States that while on his appeal, the Chief Commissioner has been pleased to reverse the decisions of the Lower courts & to order the nomination of the person who was formerly managing the affairs of the Masjid, the Taluk authorities have unjustly appointed one Khasim Khan, whom Petitioner had formerly appointed as a watchman & subsequently dismissed for neglecting his duties & who thereupon sought relief from the Special Respondent (Kasim Khan) in the case –

Petitioner also submits that the Special Respondent who had come from a different country filed a suit against him (Petitioner) in 1873 & that he therefore leaves it to the Chief Commr. to consider as

Please see C.C. order No 3678 dt 10th Oct/76. Petition not produced the order passed by the Asst Commr. 108

Endorsed 13/10/76

3-76

to who the legal claimant is.
He also adds that as his
name is not mentioned
in the Chief Commr's order
above referred to, Petitioner
had no grounds to protest
against the nomination
made by the Taluk authorities.

Prays therefore that
his name may be put in
an order & sent to the Commr
directing the latter to appoint
Petitioner for managing the
affairs of the Institution —

P.P

P.R.

No. 2044
DESPATCHED 14-10-76

حضور فیض گنجور عرض ہو ورعمل گستر حضرت کمشنر صاحب بہادر

عرضداشت

حضور اپیل وادی

از مکام تعلق مقدمہ دار سید شاہ علی سیران جناب میں عرض کرتا ہوں فدوی سید مکان مقدمہ کے فی حضور میں اپیل کرنے سے خاوند کت مکا کر دریافت کر کے لئے حکم صادر فرمائی ہیں خاوند کا لئے حکم بہت انصاف کا ہی لئے میں نمود ہی جو سید قضیہ شروع ہونے کے آگی مکان کسی مانیجر کے ذمہ میں تنا کی اوسی مانیجر کے ذمہ میں رہنا سید قضیہ شروع ہونی کے وقت گمیا را ہر کی آگے سے مکان میری اور دیم کے ذمہ میں تنا سنہ ۱۳ عیسوی میں اپیل پرتی وادی محمد غوث غیر ملک سے آکر ہمارے پر فریاد کیا اس صورت میں سید مکان کا قضیہ شروع ہونے کے آگے کسکے ذمہ میں تنا سر لکا ہوا سید بات سیانے کے لوگ بنی سمجھتے ہیں خاوند کا لئے حکم صادر ہو کر دو مہینے ہوئے تو بھی خاوند حکم موافق عمل نا جلا کر خاوند کے لئے حکم کے برخلاف عمل چلا ہی اوکیل کہی تو خود ادی ہے اور ہم ملک دکان جہاز کر یاک رکنے کے واسطے قاسم خان نامی کو مہینے سے درماہ دیکر نوکر رکہی تہا اوسی نوکری برابر کرنے سے اوسکو نکال دیا تھا ہے۔ وہ نوکر قاسم خان اپیل پرتی وادی محمد غوث کے طرف جا کر شامل ہوا ہی مسیور ارجال فصل ہی انصافی کا ہوئے سے بجبر فصل تور کر مکان کا مکان محمد غوث کے ذمہ کئی سید محمد غوث ہم نکال دی تہا سو نوکر قاسم خان کو لا کر مکان میں رکہا تہا ہے خاوند انصاف سے وہ ارجال فصل رد کر کے سیول کو جا مکان قدیم مانیجر کے ذمہ رہی سر لکا حکم دہی ہیں اب خاوند کا حکم رہتے ہوئے تعلق کے لوگ سید محمد غوث کے طرف کمک دار ہو کر ناحق تکرار درپیش لا کر خاوند کے حکم کے

حکم کے برخلاف عمل جلد سے جلد ہی تک مکان سید محمد ثبوت اور ہم مکان مذکور کو نوکر رکھنے سے سوفاسم خان کے ذمہ
کبھی نہیں اسی لئے عرض کرتا ہوں خاوند کے لشکر حکم میں میرا اور مریم کا نام نمودار نہیں ہے یہ لوگ کو تکرار
کرنی چاہیے ہی خاوند انصاف کا فیصل حکم دیا سو اوتنی کو مکان تنہا دو تم دی سر لکھا ہمارا نام اضافہ نمودار کے
اور ایک حکم دیوجی کمشنر صاحب کو کہ دروغا ہم عرضیاں ہر ورشی سوکر خاوند کے حق میں شب و عدد دست ہا
پر نہیں گے

زبانی حداد — مرقوم ۲۵ ماہ ستمبر ۱۸۷۶ء

نظم نسبی [illegible]

Entered 13/4/11 22-28

No. 220.

Name of Petitioner. Syed Shaw alli Sheron, Mokandar

Village. Konanoor

Taluk. Ashtagram

District. Mysore

Date of Arzi. 11. April 11

Date of Receipt. 12. do

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. nil

ABSTRACT.

With reference to his appe
endorsement no 2044, beg
to say that he addressed the
Dy Comr who issued an
order that the instructions
contained in the Chief Comr
letter should be carried out.
But after the decree was pas
-ed by the Dy Comr, the Amil
Dawood Khan, after known
that it was unjust, made
it (Mokan) over to Cassim
Khan Sunney (a stranger)
Again when final orders
were passed by the Chief Comr
on his appeal, the Mokhan
having been restored to him
the Amildar he held
it

hitherto - Lately the Surveyor
wrote a Gradual to the Treasury Officer
recommending that the allowance
for the Expenses of the Mokhan
might be given to the Pilt - But
the Treasury Officer having personally
spoken to the Surveyor, gave him no reply
& he has now ordered that the Mokhan
shd be given to the said Captain Khan Dummy.
The Pilt presumes that the name
in the Chiefs Comrs letter had been clearly
stated the matter might have been con-
sidered in a different light both by the Surveyor
& the Treasury Officer -

Prays that as the Chiefs Comrs final
decision has not yet been rightly carried out,
a separate order may be sent to the Dy Comr,
stating in it the name of the person in whose
possession the Mokhan should be placed
as also the name of the person who is first
required to go to the Civil -

P. P.

H Ramsay

No. 220
19/4/77

12/4/77

غریب پرور عمل کستر حضیکمشنر سی بی سانڈرس صاحب بہادر دامت دولتہ

عرضداشت

از شکر گلہ تعلقہ تھور قدیم مقام کلہ سید شاہ علی ہیر اصاحب علی عرض کرتا ہی خاوند کے ۲۰ ۴ ۴

نمبر اللہ ارسی حکم موافق تحقیق کمشنر صاحب ظاہر کرنی سے حضیکمشنر صاحب کے حکم موافق چلتا کرکے حکم دینے

مکان مذکور کا قضیہ شروع ہونے کے آگے مکان ہماری سہرو دی تھا سو عملدار جلعہ خان نی للضا فی کا

ارجنا فیصل دینے سے مکان ہمارے جیور کی محمد خوشت اور اسکو شریک ہوا سو قاسم خان کی ذمہ دی تھا سو

تعلقی عملدار خوب جانتے ہی الا سعد ملے خاوند کے اپیل فیصل کے لئے حکم موافق ہیر مکان خیر حقدار محمد خوشت اور اسکو

شریک ہوا سو قاسم خان سے جیور کی ہمارے سہرو دی اب تک مکان ہمارے سہرو دی تہا مکان کا خرچ

اور سر برآ چلنے کے واسطے درماہ ہمکو دی سرکا تعلقی عملدار مجرای افسر کو یاد داشت کلکٹر سے کیفیت

معہ سو کے عملدار داؤد خان لیہا ارجنا فیصل حضور میں رد ہوا سو عداوت سے مجرای افسر کے گھر کو جاکر

کیا کیا بولے یہی معلوم نہیں مجرای افسر عملدار کے ملاحظہ میں سترہ کی عملدار درماہ دینے لکھی تھی سو اوبا جیور دیکر

مکان خیر حقدار اور اسکو شریک ہوا سو قاسم خان کو دینا کرکے عملدار کو لکھے ہی خاوند کے

لئے ہی حاضر نام دینے سے عملدار یکطرفہ اسے سمجھی مجرای افسر عملدار داؤد خان کے بولنے پر یکطرفہ

سے سمجھی یہ تو کا معنی کوی برابر سمجھتا نہیں اور خاوند دے سو اپیل فیصل کا عمل برابر چلتا نہیں ہی

خاوند یہ غریب بچی ولاں حقدار غیر پر رحم کرکے مکان کسکے سہرو دی رہا سو اسکا نام اور

سیول میں اول کون فرار کرنا سولہ کا نام صاف نہ کرے اور ایک لشکر تکلم صادر فرمایا غریب

پروفیسر کنی ہوتا ہی

مرتحم ۱۱ ماہ اپریل ۱۹۷۷ء

سید [illegible]

Received 17-12-71

1877.78.

No. 3419-

Name of Petitioner. Mariambee & Shah alli Pheron Inamdars &

Village. Konnanoor Inakkan

Taluk. Ashtagram

District. Mysore

Date of Arzi. 14. December 71

Date of Receipt. 15= do

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Three only-

ABSTRACT.

Resubmitting the 2 enclosures of their petition no 1839 dated 23 July last, state that they addressed several petns to the Dy & Asst Commrs as ordered in the Chief Commrs Endorsement no 1839 (thereon returned), but no orders were given to them - they now hear that a letter has been sent to the Chief Commr soliciting orders for granting allowance to one Cassim Khan a Lunnata of Mohammed Khan. But as the 2nd Petr Alli Pheron is now sick, the 1st Petr Mariambee

May be referred to the Comr for report.

22/12

24.12.

Letter 24.12.71

has deputed her son Rajkumar 16
here to the Chief Commr. She begs that
on a full enquiry into her case
she may be appointed as the
Manager of the Nokan & the
allowance paid to her —

By?

L. Ramiah

1877 78

No 1

The Aktiespraeuse comm.

Dr 28 Jany 1878

Desp 35

3-75

15

Sundry Rs 3250

Fo 483

Forwards for report Petition
Re 3419 from Marcein Bee
cum Managers of Kommanoo
Mahakan, Aktiespraeu
Saliok.

No. 3250
70483

Mysore Chief Commissioner's Office.

Official Memorandum.

The accompanying Petition No. 3419, dated 14th December 1877 received at the Chief Commissioner's Office from Mariemal Dee & Chabelli Peroon, Managers of Kumaroo Makkan, Nelsapram Salute is forwarded, together with its three enclosures to the Comm of the Nelsapram Division for report.

Bangalore,
3rd January 1878.

"By Order,"
U. L.
Secretary.

This may be referred to Town Asst Jailer's report in continuation of this office No 3250 of 8 Jany/78

Entered 10.8.78

187 8.75 11

No. 1266.

Name of Petitioner. Mariyembee & Syed Shah alli Beraud Nokandar

of

Village. Konnanoor

Taluk. Bhtragrame

District. Mysore

Date of Arzi. 6. August 78

Date of Receipt. 6. do.

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Nil

ABSTRACT.

Shaik Hall when a Robbery was committed by the Mysore Dacoits & the Chiefs recommending that the arrears (of the Nokars allowance) should be granted to the Petr claimant Mohamed Ghouse Kandahari & to Cassim Khan (a servt the Petrs complained to this office from where a Robbery having been sent the money was kept in deposit - The Petrs now beg that the Months (Arrears) allowance granted to the said Cassim Khan may be ordered to be withheld until fina orders are passed in their case -

They further add that the said Md Ghouse Kandahari having sold a house at Bangalore (belonging to mother of Mariam Bee (1st Petr) an

having on it for the last 33 years ...
giving its possession to its rightful owner.
& it was decreed yesterday in the Dist. Court
Court at Bangalore that the suit brought
by Mrs Thomas Lavalin was false & that he
should give up the possession of the house at once -
The 1st Peth Marian bee says that to such a
non claimant as this, Ibrahim Sawalkhan
& the Dist Mysore officer of Mysore have
unjustly given over the Mohan, to which
the 1st Peth stands a rightful claimant -

Beg that the Mohan may be
ordered to be given over to the possession
of Mariyam bee at an early date -

A. B.?

Bangalore

No. 1266
DESPATCH

Encl. 1 & 6

ملک میسور

بحضور فیض معمور جیف کمشنر صاحب بہادر

یہہ ہی میسور دسترکت ہے

عرضداشت استگرام تعلق تنور مکاندار مریم بی اور سید شاہ علی پیران

غرضدار محمد غوث گوالیری اور نوکر قاسم خان کو غیرادہ مبلغ دینے کے واسطے روبکاری روانہ کرنے

یہہ عاجزہ اوسی وقت خاوند کے حضور مین فریادی عرض گذارش کرنے کا سبب حضور سے روبکاری حکم

جانے سے غیرادہ مبلغ صدری محمد غوث گوالیری کو نا دیکر سرکار مین امانت رکھے ہین لیکن ماہ وار

درماہ محمد غوث گوالیری اور نوکر قاسم خان کو دیتے جاتے ہین کر سنتی ہون یہہ میرا مقدمہ حضور مین فیصل

ہوے تک ماہ ہواری درماہ اونوکر قاسم خان کو نہین دیئے سرکیلا تعلق عملدار کو ترت حکم صادر فرمانا

دوسرا قلم بنگلور مین میری ماخوزادی بی بی کا خاص گھر ہمارا رہتا ہے سو بتکرار دار محمد غوث گوالیری

بنگلور دسترکت جو ڈی شاہی استانت کورٹ مین اونکا دعوی رد ہو کر وہ گھر چھوڑ دینا کر کے کل کا روز

مسٹر لیسی صاحب فیصل دیئے ہین ایسا ہوتے ہوے ایسے غیرحقدار کو یہان کے مجرائی آفیسر روبرو میسور کے عملدار

داؤد خان کمک کر کر ہمارا مکان اونکو دلائے ہین سو پوری بی دادی اور بے انصافی ہی کر خاوند ہی

تصور فرمائے جائے خاوند یہہ غریب پر رحم فرما کر خاوند کے لئے حکم موافق ہمارا مکان ہمارے ذمہ دیئے سرکیلا

غیرادہ مبلغ اور ماہ بماہ درماہ ہے ہمکو دی جائے

× جلد حکم صادر فرما کر پرورش کرما خاوند کے حق مین دست بدعا ہون گی زیادہ حد ادب ○

مرقوم ۱۴ ماہ آگست ۱۸۷۵ عیسوی رجوع سیدہ بی بی پیران

From

The Commissioner
Ackbar Alexander

To

Secretary to Chief Commissioner,
General Department.

RP
B 2735

Dated 14th

Despatched October 1879

Received

Enclosures No. Nil.

General No. 1529 | 1878-79.
Pol. No. 735

Submitting certain observations in connection with the rights of landowners in the Lonavale Khandala portion of the Bombay Deccan Railway.

No 529
7135 3

Ashtaprum Commissioner's Office
Mysore 4th October 1878.

To
The Secretary to the
Chief Commissioner of
Mysore.

In reply to your Official Memoranda Nos. 3250 and 1628/FD:483 of 8th January and 22d August/FD:148 1878 — forwarding petitions from Marian Bee and Syed Shah Alli Pheroz Managers of the Konanoore — Malkan in the Ashtaprum — Taluk, complaining that their enjoyment of the Office of — Managers in the Malkan has been unjustly interfered with by the local Authorities, I have the honor to state for the information of the Chief Commissioner that on receipt of the Chief Commissioner's Proceedings No: 3678/108 dated 10th July 1876, directing that the parties be referred to a regular Suit for the establishment of their rights pending which the Malkan should be left in possession of the party who were actually the Managers — before the dispute arose, the necessary instructions were issued to the — Deputy Commissioner &c to give

Effect

effect to the above order.

In carrying this out the Municipal allowed petitioners to take possession of the Markkam as he was of opinion that they were in charge of it prior to the date of dispute. Upon this Mahomed Yousuf Shaukry contended that the Markkam was always under his control and management so that he was actually the Manager before the dispute arose. Hakeem Sahib who was in charge of the institution also contended on behalf of Mahomed Yousuf. After enquiry, the Municipal Officer decided that Hakeem Sahib on behalf of Mohamed Yousuf Shaukry was the actual Manager of the Markkam before the dispute arose and he was accordingly allowed to remain in possession of the Markkam. Dissatisfied with this, Petitioners have appealed to the Chief Commissioner urging that they were the Managers before the dispute arose. This allegation does not appear to have been proved before the Municipal Officer.

The proceedings of the case are herewith, sent for reference together

1809

Letter with the Petitions.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obedient Servt
Railway
Commissioners
Acting pro tem

ಶ್ರೀ

ಶ್ರೀಮತ್ ಮಹಾಮಂಡಲೇಶ್ವರ ಶ್ರೀ ಕೃಷ್ಣದೇವರಾಯರ ಪಟ್ಟಾಭಿಷೇಕ ಶಕವರ್ಷ 1431 ನೆಯ ಪ್ರಮಾದೀ ಸಂವತ್ಸರ ಮಾರ್ಗಶಿರ ಶುದ್ಧ 13 ಆದಿತ್ಯವಾರ ಸೂರ್ಯಗ್ರಹಣ ಪರ್ವಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಕೃಷ್ಣದೇವರಾಯರು ಶ್ರೀ ವಿರೂಪಾಕ್ಷ ದೇವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಶಾಸನ

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೃಷ್ಣದೇವರಾಯರು ಶ್ರೀ ವಿರೂಪಾಕ್ಷ ದೇವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಶಾಸನ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಶ್ರೀ ವಿರೂಪಾಕ್ಷ ದೇವರ ಸೇವೆಗಾಗಿ ಹಾಗೂ ಅವರ ಉತ್ಸವಾದಿಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಹಂಪೆಯ ಸುತ್ತಮುತ್ತಲಿನ ಕೆಲವು ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳನ್ನು ಅಗ್ರಹಾರವಾಗಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರು. ಆ ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹಂಪೆಯ ಸಮೀಪದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಕಮಲಾಪುರವೂ ಒಂದು. ಈ ಗ್ರಾಮವನ್ನು ಶ್ರೀ ವಿರೂಪಾಕ್ಷ ದೇವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಾಗ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಮನೆಗಳಿದ್ದವು. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಮನೆಗಳವರು ಶ್ರೀ ವಿರೂಪಾಕ್ಷ ದೇವರ ಸೇವೆಗಾಗಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಗ್ರಾಮವಾದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಸಿಸಲು ಇಷ್ಟಪಡಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ಆ ಗ್ರಾಮವನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಹೊರಟುಹೋದರು. ಆ ಗ್ರಾಮವನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಹೋದವರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವರು ಹಂಪೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿಕೊಂಡು ವಾಸಿಸಿದರು. ಇನ್ನು ಕೆಲವರು ಹಂಪೆಯ ಸಮೀಪದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಬೇರೆ ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಸಿಸಿದರು. ಆ ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳು ಶ್ರೀ ವಿರೂಪಾಕ್ಷ ದೇವರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ್ದವು. ಆ ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಸಿಸಿದವರು ಶ್ರೀ ವಿರೂಪಾಕ್ಷ ದೇವರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಸಿಸಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ಶ್ರೀ ವಿರೂಪಾಕ್ಷ ದೇವರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದವರಾದರು. ಆ ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಸಿಸಿದವರು ಶ್ರೀ ವಿರೂಪಾಕ್ಷ ದೇವರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದವರಾದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ಶ್ರೀ ವಿರೂಪಾಕ್ಷ ದೇವರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದವರಾದರು. ಆ ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಸಿಸಿದವರು ಶ್ರೀ ವಿರೂಪಾಕ್ಷ ದೇವರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದವರಾದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ಶ್ರೀ ವಿರೂಪಾಕ್ಷ ದೇವರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದವರಾದರು.

Copy

(Signed) Srinivasa Rao
Magisterial Officer
Mysore District.

Rs. 1

For Deputy Commissioner
Mysore Dist.

Please see orders on P No 7266 — The report called for from Commr Adm in the Offic No 1628 dtd 22nd Augt 78 may be 7D148 awarded.

11/10/78

Cattle 12-10-78

Revenue 7-10-1 1878.-79

No. 1687

Name of Petitioner. Marayam Bibi - Khadima (Permanent) Manager of the Makkan at

Village. Sonnur

Taluk. Ashtagram

District. Mysore

Date of Arzi. 8/10/78

Date of Receipt. 8/10/78

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Nil

ABSTRACT.

States that as Khasim Khan who was employed by Petr to succeed the Makka was dismissed for neglect to discharge his duties, he joined with Mahamad Yasin of Salem who has no Makk, and caused her much trouble and that as Khasim Khan is now dead she has submitted this Arzi by Said Shah Ali Saheb

Begs that after enquiring into the facts that Petr has been the Manager of the Makka that Khasim Khan is dead, that the arrears of pay has been held in deposit agreeably to the Offic Rubkari; and that Petr was in possession of the Makka the Amildar may be ordered to make over the Makkan to Petr and to pay her the arrears of pay or allowance.

J K Srinivasa Iyangar

No. 1687

بحضور فیض گنجور چیف کمشنر صاحب بہادر ملک میسور دام دولتہ

عرضداشت

اشتگرام تعلق تنور مکان کے قدیم مانیجر مریم بی بی عرضدار ہی کہ غریب پرور مکان کے جہاز نے وغیرہ کے واسطے نوکر رکھی تھی سو میر الوکر قاسم خانکو عین نکال دینے سے غیر ملک یعنے سلیم والے غیر محمد اکبر محمد غوث گوالیر یکے طرف جاکر شامل ہوکے اتنا قصہ فساد برپا کیا تھا اب وہ نوکر قاسم خان مرگیا ہی اسواسطے سید شاہ علی پیر صاحب کے ماتھہ یہ عرضی دیکر جناب عین روانہ کری ہون خاوند مہربانی فرماکر عین انعایت سے مکانکی مانیجر ہون سو مکان مرے ذمہ تھا سو اور نوکر قاسم خان مرگیا ہی سو خاوند کے حضور سے روکھا کی دکھانے مبلغ غیر ارادہ اُسکو نا دیکر امانت رکھے ہین سو تعلق عملدار سے رپورت منگاکر میرا مکان میرے ذمہ کردے سر کاتعلق عملدار کو حکم دیکر یہہ غریب عورت ذات کو پرورش فرمانا

زیادہ القاب دولت تابان و درخشان باد بتاریخ ۳ ماہ اکتوبر سنہ ۶۸ء

عرضداشت

رجوع مریم بی بی

Not stamped
B.M. 14/11/78
Revd. 15.11.78

1878-79

No. 1962

Name of Petitioner. Mariambee Inam Goneadar of Murzai Depto

Village.
Taluk. Bangalore
District.

Date of Arzi. 4-11-78

Date of Receipt. 6-11-78

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Nil.

ABSTRACT.

States that the Inamkhan at Tonnanoor has been in the enjoyment of her family from the days of her ancestors. After her grandfather Arabisha Sahebs death, Petis father Sajada Saheb was the hana- -ger of the said Inamkhan Enjoying the Inam 4 pay; after her father's death, her mother Khojadibee was the manager; after her, Pete became the manager which post she held for near 18 years; during her mother time of office, one Khassim Khan was appointed as the

Sweeper to the Inamdar; the
Sweeper not doing his work
well, Peta removed him from
Service; one Mahomed Gouse
of Salem and the said Sweeper
leaguing together preferred a
groundless action against the
Inamdar; the Amildar of
Mysore gave a decree in favor
of Mahomed Gouse who is
rich; when this order was appealed
against to the Chief Comr.
a letter was sent to the Dy Comr[illegible];
in accordance with which the
Amildar went to Thondanur,
ordered Mahomed Gouse to leave
the Inamdar which was put in possession of
Peta. The Amildar of Mysore & Mr Srinivas Row
the Mysore Asst in contravention of the Chief
Comrs order put the Inamdar in possession of
the opposite party. Under the foregoing cir-
-cumstances Peta begs that after enquiry
into this irregular procedure, the Inamdar
be ordered to be put in his possession -

M.B.S. Kashani

DEPAR 1962

691/21-5 (2062)

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೃಷ್ಣಮೂರ್ತಿ ಅವರು ಕಾಲಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುವ ಮನವಿಗಳ ಮೇರೆಗೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ. 12/1 ಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದ 1-8 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಸಾಗುವಳಿ ಚೀಟಿಯನ್ನು ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಲು ಕೋರಿರುವ ವಿಷಯವು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಯಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಈ ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಸಾಗುವಳಿ ಚೀಟಿಯನ್ನು ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಲು ಕೋರಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಕೃಷ್ಣಮೂರ್ತಿ ಅವರು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುವ ಮನವಿಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲು ಕೋರಿರುವ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಪತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಈ ಕಛೇರಿಯಿಂದ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಪತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೋರಿರುವಂತೆ ಈ ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಸಾಗುವಳಿ ಚೀಟಿಯನ್ನು ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಲು ಯಾವುದೇ ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಸಾಗುವಳಿ ಚೀಟಿಯನ್ನು ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಲು ಯಾವುದೇ ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಸಾಗುವಳಿ ಚೀಟಿಯನ್ನು ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಲು ಯಾವುದೇ ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಸಹಾಯಕ ಕಮೀಷನರ್ ಅವರ ಕಛೇರಿ

ಚಿತ್ರದುರ್ಗ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ

ದಿನಾಂಕ: 17-11-1962

۵۹

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

18/12/77

Assistant Clerk

From

To
The Commissioner of
Ashm du

Dated
Despatched 18 November 14
Received

Enclosures No: Progs received by S. Eyak

General No. 2407
No. 249

docket No 529-35-
of 14/10/14 informing
that the Mugrin officer
after enquiry decided that
one Kasim Khan was in
charge of the Makan at-
Tomoor &c

Requests he will be
so good as to call upon
the Mugrin officer to report
more fully the grounds
on which he found (a finding)
in opposition to the Mugrin of the Amin
-dar that Kasim Khan
not Mariambee was in
possession of the Dirga
at Tomoor before
the dispute arose -
The enclosures of this docket
are herewith returned for
reenbmission with the
report

Secretary

Rec 6/11

Sept 27

1879.-80

No. 491

Name of Petitioner. Narayan Bibi Manager of the Makkan ai

Village. Konanur

Taluk. Ashtagram

District. Mysore

Date of Arzi. 26/5/79

Date of Receipt. 26/5/79

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Nil

ABSTRACT.

Begs for the return of the 3 enclosures of the Petn that she submitted 8 or 9 months ago.

M. Srinivasa Ayangar

Enclosures returned
Ast 14/8/79.

B 26 5 191

491

41

حضور عالی ماحور حیف بخشنر جلیب باکد ملک میسور دام اقبالہ

عرضداشت عاجزہ اشتہار تعلق تسخیر حکامدار مریم پاے عرض بدرجہ

تحریر پرور شمار آنست نوں ماہ کے ایک فرمان عرضی کے ہمراہ نبی اصل ملفوفیان

ملفوف کرکے گذارے ہوں اور ملفوفیان ہیہ عاجزہ کو بہوت ضرور

ہی صدور ملفوفیان واپس دی جاسکیا حکم ہونا ہوتا ہو کہ میرا

حکمان میری سپردگی کی سرکیا حکم صادر فرمان بہوے رورسے

عاجزہ پرورش کے حکم کی امیدوار و منتظر ہے زیادہ حد ادبے

مرقوم ۲۶ ماہ مئی ۱۷۹۹ء

عرضی بجوع مریم پاے

Entered 8-7-77

1877. 781

No. 1039

Name of Petitioner. Syed Shah Allie Peran and Inamdar Bee Inamdaroo of

Village.

Taluk. Nelleghaum

District. Mysore

Date of Arzi. 11th July 1877

Date of Receipt. 11th Do - Do -

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Three

Petn must produce the orders passed on their representations & Copy of the Amildar's order of 13th Dec last

20/7

Entd 21/7.

Entered 23/7/77 - 15

15

ABSTRACT.

Stated that they presented a Mundustanee Petn also a Petn two months ago to this office, and be-ccused an endorsement directing them to produce the last order issued from the Local Authorities, that he accordingly submits the same; that after receiving the Proceedings, an order No. 3678 of 10th July 1876 was issued to the Comrs directing that the Inamdaree be left in the possession of the party who was actually the manager upon the dispute arose pending the decision of a court to which the parties should be referred to establish their right - that in receipt of this order the Mungalore officers directed the Inamdaree to be made over to the individual who was actually the manager; that the Amildar accordingly made over the Inamdaree to Petr; that two months after the Mungalore officers ordered it to be made over to them of powers Brahmins Gowda and other Inamdaree

unto the Panchayat's should be which the Ch. Comr's Proceedings were referred to, cancelled. Beg that orders may issue to restore the Mokasi.

Order to the Amildar of the Ashtagram Taluk dy 13th December 1876

With reference to your reports No. 576 and 631 dy 13th Oct and 24th Nov. you informed that in the Ch. Comr's Rs it was stated that the decision of the Panchayet should not be considered as valid and the widow of the appellant should establish her right to the Darga in a civil court, till then the Darga should remain under the management of those in whose possession it has been placed before.

After the above was intimated to you, it was informed in your report No. 576 that the Darga was placed in the possession of Mariem Bee and her son.

It is clear from the Ch. Comr's Proceedings that the adoption of Mariem Bee should be determined by a Civil Court, and when such is the case, your proceeding in having placed the Darga in the possession of such a person is objectionable.

It has been clearly admitted by the parties that the Darga was in charge of Hussain Ithaim who states that he is an agent of Syed Shah Mahomed Gouse Gavalee; that the balance of the Aya, after deducting expenses, was paid to the ancestors of Syed Shah Mahomed Gouse, and afterwards to himself and his agents.

From this, it is clear that before also the dispute took place, Syed Shah Mahomed Gouse Gavalee was the manager of the Mokasa.

and

that Hussain Ithaim was in charge of the agent Hussain Ithaim

You are requested to explain on what grounds you gave charge of the Mokasa to Mariem Bee, and her son contrary to the Ch. Comr's orders.

On the account complaints have been made to the Comr and Deputy Comr from whom you should have been received called for Report.

As soon as you receive this order, you should make over charge of the Mokasa to Hussain Ithaim the agent of Gavalee, and obtain his receipt and forward the same to this office with your report. With regard to the Aya &c. you should act as usual.

P.S. Twenty four hours after the receipt of this order, you should personally carry out this order and make a report.

To, Genl. 6 / 13

No 1839
DESPATCHED 25-7-77

114/220

E. B. Saunders Esqre C. B.

Chief Commissioner of Mysore.

Honored Sir,

We Syed Shaffy Peeran and Maricam Lebbe Formers Maraan dars in the Ashtagram Taluk beg respectfully to lay the following for your honor's favourable consideration.

We presented a Hindoostanee Petition about two months ago, when we received an Endorsement to the effect that we should produce the Lobtardars received from the Local Authorities. We herewith submit the same.

Your honor some time ago called for all the Proceedings in the case and after reviewing passed an order Vide Ch. Commr's Proceedings No. 3678/108 dated 10th July 1876 (a copy of which was given to us) In this proceedings your honor was pleased to direct that the Maraan be left in the possession of the party who was actually the Managers before the dispute arose pending the decision of a Court to which the parties should be referred to establish their right.

On the receipt of this order the Moozaii officer issued an order No. 7 dated 12. August 1876 directing

directing the Amildar to make over the Inam to the individual who was the actual manager.

The Amildar accordingly took the Inam away from Mohamed Gouse and his servant Kasim Khan, and made the same over thus.

The Amildar Dawood Khan of Mysore finding that his decision was reversed, and through spite, told something to the Mysore officer. who being favourably disposed towards him, passed a second order No 26 dated 13th Decr 1876 to the effect that the Amildar did not carry out the order correctly and directing him to make over the Inam to Mohamed Gouse and Khasim Khan in accordance with the opinion given the Panchayets. Analyzer directly in opposition to the former part of the Ch. Commissr Proceedings above quoted.

We beg respectfully to state that your honors orders were not carried out as we were all along the Managers until the dispute took place The question at issue is whether the adoption of Mariam Bee (2nd Wife) as heir to the Mutt by Khajadee Bee is valid under Mohamedan Law. This point should as directed be decided by a competent Civil Court. Mohamed Gouse and the other has not as yet

gone in to Court to decide this question on their right to the Inam.

I beg respectfully that your honor will be pleased to give this petition your kind Consideration and order the restoration of the Inam to us on the conditions contained in your honors Proceedings.

We beg respectfully to remain

Honored Sir

11-7-77 your most obedient and humble

Servant

سید علی صاحب

1879. 80 -

41

No. 1196.

Name of Petitioner. Mariyan Ibee -

Kadeem Manager of Ikoranum Mosque in the Ashtagram Sub-Division Village. was put up in the Attavoolah Mohalla

Taluk. Nannilli - Nangatam Nangatam

District. Do

Date of Arzi. 20. Aug 79

Date of Receipt. 21. " 80

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Nil

Petition not stamped.

No report called for in this Office Docket No 2407 dated 8th Nov 1878 does not appear to have been yet received

This petition may be sent to the Comm Asstt Jaffna in continuation of the above, for early report. JS

13/8

Tendered forwarded to Comm Asstt JS

41.

3-75

79

ABSTRACT.

States that when one Mohamme's Ghouse (who had come from Salem) died, sent at Mayaveram regarding his claims to the Petta Mosque, it was unjustly decided in his favour by the Mayaveram officer Petta then appealed to the Chief Court, who after the examination of the records of her case, was pleased to send a letter (to whom?) that the Mosque in question should

be allowed to remain in the
possession of the Madeira Manager
& the Mukan was accordingly
restored to Lobo possession by
order of the Minister. But
about 6 or 7 months afterwards,
the Mukan was taken back
from Lobo possession & given over
Mohamed Ghouse on main without
sufficient grounds.

Upon that on a full enquiry
into her case, the Mukan in
question may be ordered to be
restored to her possession as usual.

Plaintiff

42

R

To 47

Theforwarded Ashtupeen

Dispd 6th October 1879

Ll No 3485
P 440

Forwards Petition № 1196
from Mariam Bee Kadeen
Manager of the Makkan
at Khonnur, Ashtun Taluk

No. 3405
P. 440

Mysore Chief Commissioner's Office.

Official Memorandum.

The accompanying Petition No. 1196, dated 20th July 78 received at the Chief Commissioner's Office from Murtiam Bee, Kadeem Inamdar of the Dusthkan at Nursapur in the Kolar Dr. is forwarded, ~~together with its enclosures~~ to the Deputy Commr. of the Kolar Dr. in Continuation of this office No. 2407/269 dt. 8th December 78.

BANGALORE,
6th Octr. 1879.

"By Order,"

H.
for Rev. Secretary.

(General Serial No. 32.)

1880.

No. 2671.

Name of Petitioner. Mariamma Beebee

Village. Bangalore

Taluk. Do

District. Do

Date of Arzi. 17-1-81.

Date of Receipt. 1-2-81.

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. 2. Two only.

ABSTRACT.

Petitioner on behalf of herself complaining that the wrongful dismissal of her husband from the service by Mr. Greenwood Mysore Officer only 8 months after the latter took charge of it by the Commissioner has given rise to many false reports, her claim that her husband may be reinstated or that she may

rightful heir & to Nirtan. 51

(1 Rupee stamp)

ordered accordingly.

2 Ry Council for respt

[illegible] Chandrathan

To The Ry. Commr.
Bangalore.
Dated 4th Feby. 191
Sir, I have
the honour
to